

Serial No. 10/787,270  
Reply to Office Action of 28 May 2009  
Amendment filed 30 November 2009

**REMARKS**

As a preliminary matter, the Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application. Claims 1-58 remain in the application and of these claims 1-31 are withdrawn from consideration.

In the Office Action of 28 May 2009, claims 32-58 were rejected on various statutory grounds, as described in further detail below. Claims 32, 37, 40, 44, and 55 are amended herein. Support for the amendment is found at least in the claims as originally filed and paragraphs [0047]-[0048] and FIGS. 6A-6C and FIG. 2B of the specification as filed. No new matter has been added. Applicant requests reconsideration and further examination of the subject application based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

***Election/Restriction***

In the Office Action, the Examiner made final the previous restriction requirement. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration under 37 CFR § 1.181 of the restriction requirement.

***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112***

In the Office Action, claims 32-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the Applicant's invention. Applicant submits that the amendments to the claims herein overcome the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112.

More specifically, regarding claim 32 the Examiner stated that the Applicant should clarify the structure/arrangement and configuration of the conductive shielding relative to the primary and secondary magnetic cores. Claim 32 is amended herein to recite that the conductive shielding is configured "as two continuous, circular half toroidal shells, each shell surrounding a respective one of

Serial No. 10/787,270  
Reply to Office Action of 28 May 2009  
Amendment filed 30 November 2009

the primary and secondary cores except for a portion adjacent the air gap,” as described at paragraphs [0047]-[0048] and shown in FIGS. 6A-6C and FIG. 2B of the specification as filed.

Regarding claim 33, the Examiner stated that the Applicant should clarify the configuration of the conductive shielding so as to create a substantially continuous conductive path around the axis of rotation. Applicant submits that the amendment to claim 32, renders the rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as moot.

Regarding claim 37, the Examiner stated that there is no antecedent basis for “the conductive shell.” In response, claim 37 has been amended to recite that “each of the primary and secondary cores is configured as an annular conductive shell.”

Regarding claims 40 and 55, the Examiner stated that the Applicant should clarify the electrical contact between the conductive shell. In response, claims 40 and 55 have been amended to clarify that the “segments of each shell are electrically connected to one another”.

Regarding claim 44, the Examiner stated that the Applicant should clarify the structure/arrangement of the conductive shielding relative to the first and second transformer portions. In response, claim 44 is amended herein to recite that the conductive shielding is configured “as two continuous, circular half toroidal shells, each shell surrounding a respective one of the primary and secondary transformer portions except for a portion adjacent the air gap,” as described at paragraphs [0047]-[0048] and shown in FIGS. 6A-6C and FIG. 2B of the specification as filed.

Finally, regarding claim 49, the Examiner stated that the Applicant should clarify the configuration of the conductive shielding so as to create a substantially continuous conductive path. Applicant submits that the amendment to claim 44, renders the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as moot.

Serial No. 10/787,270  
Reply to Office Action of 28 May 2009  
Amendment filed 30 November 2009

***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102***

In the Office Action, claims 32 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 01123406 to Nishino et al. (“Nishino”). Without acceding to the Examiner’s assertions made for the rejection, Applicant notes that claims 32 and 44 are amended herein to include, among other things: “a primary transformer portion including a primary winding;” and “a secondary transformer portion including a secondary winding;” and “wherein at least one of said primary and said secondary windings comprises a fractional turn winding.” [Emphasis added]

Nishino is not understood as teaching each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 32 and 44. Thus, Nishino forms and improper basis for a rejection of claims 32 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection accordingly.

***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In the Office Action, claims 32-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Nishino, previously cited. Without acceding to the Examiner’s assertions made for the rejection, Applicant notes that claims 32 and 44 are amended herein as described above.

Nishino is not understood as teaching or suggesting each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 32 and 44. Thus, Nishino forms and improper basis for a rejection of claims 32-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection accordingly.

Serial No. 10/787,270  
Reply to Office Action of 28 May 2009  
Amendment filed 30 November 2009

**CONCLUSION**

On the basis of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore earnestly solicited.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment of the Office Action does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be other reasons for patentability of any or all claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede, or an actual concession of, any issue with regard to any claim, or any cited art, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Date: 30 November 2009

/G. Matthew McCloskey/

G. Matthew McCloskey, Reg. No.: 47,025

28 State Street

Boston, MA 02109-1775

Telephone: (617) 535-4082

Facsimile: (617) 535-3800